Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Summary Report

MA-125

Happy Valley Flood Protection

Maui, Hawaii

Prepared by:

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HONOLULU ENGINEER DISTRICT

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

May 2006

Dam ID: MA-125
Name: Happy Valley Fld. Prot.

Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Conducted on: 06 April 2006

I. Purpose

Due to disaster occurrences of periodic heavy rains and flooding, which has caused extensive damage to property and loss of lives, the Governor has issued a State of Emergency Proclamation extending from February 20, 2006 to April 9, 2006. In light of the tragic failure of the Kaloko dam on Kauai and the continued forecast of heavy rains, emergency inspections of all regulated dams in all counties are being undertaken.

These inspections are for the purpose of determining if any of the regulated dams and reservoirs in the City and County of Honolulu, Maui County or Hawaii County, are suspect for immediate concern to the downstream area under the prolonged conditions of heavy rain showers.

II. Authority

Inspections are authorized under the Hawaii Dam Safety Act of 1987, Chapter 179D "Dams and Reservoirs" of Hawaii Revised Statues, and Title 13, Subtitle 7, Chapter 190, "Dams and Reservoirs" of the Hawaii Administrative Rules.

These inspections are being conducted under joint agreements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the State of Hawaii. The Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is entered into pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 3036(d)(2), and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (31 U.S.C. §6505), and established via support agreement number DL-06-01.

III. Scope

Visual inspection will be made on parts of the embankment and appurtenant works readily available and visible for inspection by the inspection team at the time of the inspection. Such parts and appurtenant works would include the upstream slope, crest, downstream slope, abutments and toes, outlet works, and spillway.

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there may appear to be no immediate threat to the safety of the dam, however no assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

IV. Limitations of Findings and Recommendations

The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. The inspection does not entail detailed stability, hydrologic, hydraulic, or seismic investigations. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies.

V. Inspection Team

Organization	Name /Title
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Jon Kolber Geotechnical Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	John Dillon Geotechnical Engineer
State of Hawaii, Dept of Land and Natural Resources	Curtis Powers Civil Engineer
USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service	Diana Perry

VI. Owner's Representatives Present

None

VII. Summary Report Team

Organization	Name
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Derek Chow Bill Empson
State of Hawaii, Dept of Land and Natural Resources	Denise Manuel Edwin Matsuda

VIII. Dam Type

The dam appeared to be an earthen embankment dam.

IX. Dam Classification

The current hazard classification of this dam is: High

Hazard Potential Classification based on the following:

Category	Loss of Life	Economic Loss
Low	None Expected	Minimal (undeveloped to occasional structures or agriculture)
Significant	Few (No Urban development and no more than a small number of inhabitable structures)	Appreciable (Notable agriculture, industry or structures)
High	More than a few	Extensive community, industry or agriculture.

Based on inventoried storage and height data, the size classification of the dam is: Most likely Small.

Size Classification based on the following:

Category	Storage (Acre-Feet)	Height (feet)
Small	< 1000	< 40
Intermediate	> 1000 and < 50,000	> 40 and < 100
Large	> 50,000	> 100

X. Summary of Inspection

Condition Rating Criteria: The conditional terms in this report are used to generally describe the conditions below. Inspections, monitoring, and additional investigations are considered to be incidental to all condition ratings.

Satisfactory	Expected to fulfill intended function.
Fair	Expected to fulfill intended function, but maintenance is recommended.
Poor	May not fulfill intended function; maintenance or repairs are necessary.
Unsatisfactory	Is not expected to fulfill intended function; repair, replacement, or modification is necessary.
Unknown	Not visible, not accessible, not inspected, or unable to determine the condition rating based on the observation taken.

Dam ID: MA-125
Name: Happy Valley Fld. Prot.

A. General appearance:

This reservoir was completed in 1981 and continues to operate as a water detention structure. The structure is 16 feet deep and approximately 140 feet long. This structure is not a dam.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
b. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
c. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard classification. Submit an EAP for this facility.
d. Submit narrative and additional information detailing the improvements, modifications and/or alterations at the dam site, unless covered by approved dam permit.
e. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
f. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
g. The dam did not appear to be maintained on a regular basis.
h. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
i. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility.
j. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits.
k. Emergency Alarms / Monitors: There were no alarms or monitors observed on this reservoir.
l. Power / Communication: There were no communication systems observed on this reservoir.

B. Access / Security:

Access to the dam was accomplished by parking on a residential street and walking approximately 1/8 mile up the slope of a building lot. A four-wheel drive vehicle is not required.

Security issues. Access to the dam is unrestricted.

C. Intake Works: (Satisfactory)

Water flows into the reservoir by surface flow through a gully approximately 15 feet high by 10 feet wide. Flow from an overflowing irrigation ditch also enters the reservoir.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The intake works appeared to be in satisfactory condition. No corrective actions are required at this time.

D. Reservoir: (Fair)
The reservoir was dry at the time of inspection. The normal operating level is unknown and there appears to be no staff gage. The reservoir is overgrown by tall grass and appears to have not been maintained.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
a. The reservoir appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
b. A staff gage was not observed in the reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.
c. The tall grass in the reservoir needs to be mowed and maintained.

E. Upstream Slope: (Fair)
The upstream slope is covered with grass on a 2 on 1 slope. Loose riprap is placed on part of the upstream slope. The upstream slope is overgrown by tall grass.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
a. The upstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
b. Slope protection needs maintenance. The tall grass needs to be mowed and maintained on a regular basis.
c. The upstream slope was not visible due to high grass. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.

F. Crest: N/A
This structure has no crest. It appears to have been excavated as a basin.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
N/A

G. Downstream Slope: (N/A)
This structure has no downstream slope. It appears to have been excavated as a basin.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
N/A

H. Abutments / Toe: (N/A)
This structure has no abutments/toe. It appears to have been excavated as a basin.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
N/A.

I. Outlet Works: (N/A)
This structure has no outlet works. Water at high reservoir levels will flow directly out the spillway.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
N/A

J. Spillway: (Satisfactory)
This spillway consisted of a triangular concrete pad approximately 20 feet wide by 20 feet long with concrete wing walls, which are about 10 feet high. A trash rack was installed over the spillway on the top of the wing walls.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
a. The Spillway appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

K. Down Stream Channel: (Unknown)
The downstream channel is a concrete lined U-shaped ditch approximately 5 feet wide by 7 feet tall. It drains water away from the reservoir towards the Iao Stream. A subdivision was in the process of being developed at the time of this inspection, with no houses existing along this stream immediately below the structure.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
a. The downstream channel was not inspected.

XI. Additional Comments:

Based on visual observations and discussion of operational procedures of the day, there is no immediate threat to the safety of the structure at this time.

This structure is an excavated basin and is not a dam.

The Happy Valley Flood Protection structure resembles a flood retention basin rather than an earth dam. It has no crest or downstream slope and was excavated as a basin without construction of an embankment.
This is an extremely small facility (0.37 acre-feet). It appears its purpose is to capture drainage from the watershed above the facility and drain it down to Iao Stream below.
This facility has not been maintained. It seems to function as such with a spillway and outlet channel that is in good condition, despite the lack of maintenance.
Recommend this facility be inspected by its owner and maintained by mowing the high grass in the reservoir and upstream slope.

PHOTOGRAPHS

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 View of the dam outlet channel, looking upstream.

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Panoramic view 1

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Panoramic view 2

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Panoramic view 3

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Panoramic view 4

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Panoramic view 5

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Panoramic view 6

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Reservoir

MA-125 Happy Valley Flood Prevention

125 Spillway – note the trash rack

FIELD INSPECTION SHEETS

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Vulnerability Index:
Extreme 1 | High 2 | Moderate 3 | Low 4

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

STATE OF HAWAII - DLNR
DAM SAFETY INSPECTION SHEET

Inspection Type: Visual Dam Safety Inspection

Persons Present	Affiliation	Phone Number
Jon Kolber	US Army Corps of Engineers	
Curtis Powers	~~Maui County~~ Hawai'i DLNR	
John Dillon	U.S. Army Corp of Engineers	
Diona Perry	USDA/NRCS	

Weather Condition: ☐ Rain previous day ☐ Rainy ☐ Drizzle / Mist ☒ Cloudy/Overcast ☐ Partly Cloudy ☐ Sunny ☐ Dry
Comments: _____

---

1. General: *(Information currently on file, update as required)*

Dam/Res. Name	HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION		
Owner	Maui County, Department of Public Works		*(C021)*
Owner Contact	Mr. Leonard B. Costa	Owner Ph.	
Lessee	N/A	Lessee Ph.	
O & M Contractor	Owner	O & M Ph.	
Nearest Town	PUUOHALA VILLAGE	Latitude	20.8967° (decimal)
County	MAUI	Longitude	156.5217° (decimal)
Tax Map Key(s)			

Dam Status	A:	Hazard Potential	H:	Dam Size	
Year Completed	1981	Dam Length	140 ft.	Dam Height	16 ft.
Normal Storage	0.37 ac.ft.	Max. Storage	0.37 ac.ft.	Max. Surface Area	0.2 ac.
Drainage Area	0.22 mi.	Spillway Type		Max. Spillway Q	445 cfs

Owner owns land under dam facility: _____
Emergency Action Plan on file with the Department: NO
Reports on file with the Department: March 1999 = Hirata, Phase I Study

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

2. Questions for Owner's Rep.:

	Yes	No	Unknown	Comments
Construction Plans Available	☐	☐	☒	
Site / Facility Map	☐	☐	☒	
Operation & Maintenance Manual	☐	☐	☒	
Emergency Action Plan	☐	☐	☒	
Modifications / Improvements	☐	☐	☒	
Conduct Routine Inspections	☐	☒	☐	
Conduct Routine Maintenance	☐	☒	☐	
Vehicle access to site	☒	☐	☐	☐ Not accessible ☒ With Standard car ☐ Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Access during heavy rains	☒	☐	☐	☐ Not accessible ☒ With Standard car ☐ Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Access when spillway is flowing	☒	☐	☐	☐ Not accessible ☒ With Standard car ☐ Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Other Studies Conducted	☐	☐	☒	☐ Phase I ☐ Phase II ☐ Hydraulics ☐ Stability ☐ Hazard ☐ Seismic ☐ Other: _____
Incident History	☐	☐	☒	☐ Breached ☐ Overtop ☐ Slide ☐ Down stream Flooding ☐ Other: _____
Reservoir's Current Use	☒	☐	☐	☐ Sediment ☐ Irrigation ☐ Recreation ☒ Flood Control ☐ Drinking Water ☐ Power Generation ☒ Other: This appears to be a small water detention basin.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- ☒ a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
- ☐ b. An Emergency Action Plan (EAP) is on file with the department, submit any updates as applicable.
- ☐ c. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
- ☒ d. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard class. Submit EAP if developed for the facility.
- ☒ e. Submit narrative and additional information detailing the improvements, modifications, and/or alterations at the dam site, unless covered by approved dam permit.
- ☒ f. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
- ☒ g. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
- ☒ h. The dam did not appear to be maintained on a regular basis.
- ☒ i. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
- ☐ j. There is no vehicular access to the dam site. Operational and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ k. Access to dam is questionable during severe weather conditions and/or spillway overflows. Operational plans and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ l. Provide a detailed narrative of the incident, responses taken, and any damages incurred. Dam owners are required to promptly advise the department of any sudden or unprecedented flood or unusual or alarming circumstance or occurrences which may adversely affect the dam or reservoir.
- ☒ m. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility.
- ☒ n. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits.
- ☐ o. _____

Additional Requirements:

The following investigative study(s) are:

Required	Recommended	
☐	☐	Phase I Study
☐	☐	Phase II Study (Including ☐ Seepage ☐ Hydrology/Hydraulics ☐ EAP)
☐	☐	Hydrology and Hydraulics (including Probable Maximum Flood and spillway capacity)
☐	☐	Stability Analysis
☐	☐	Seismic Analysis
☐	☐	Hazard Classification
☐	☒	Other: The classification of this facility as a dam is questioned – refer to comments on Page 10.

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

Physical Dam Features: (Check All Applicable. Provide description of Items Observed and/or Take Photos. Indicate photo # in description.)

3. Reservoir:

Level during inspection Dry ft per Eye (gage / other)

Normal Operating Level/Range N/A ft per N/A (gage / other)

Description: _____

Typical Operation ☐ Spillway always flowing ☐ Kept within normal range ☐ Kept Empty ☐ Drained Daily ☒ Only filled by Storms ☐ Other: _____

Sinkhole in Res.: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ by _____ in. Deep ☒ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Staff Gage: Description: None

Findings:

- ☐ a. The reservoir was not inspected.
- ☐ b. The reservoir appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☒ c. The reservoir appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The reservoir appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. The staff gage needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☒ f. A staff gage was not observed at the reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.
- ☐ g. A sinkhole was observed in the upstream reservoir. Conduct additional investigations and monitoring to identify the cause, risk and appropriate action.
- ☒ h. The reservoir is overgrown with tall grass and hay not been maintained - Needs to be Mowed

4. Intake Works Description:

☒ Number of Intakes 1

☒ Intake (Culvert / Pipe)

Size: _in. ☐ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☒ Concrete ☐ Other _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed None

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☐ Other Irrigation

☒ Ditch / Flume

Dimension: 15' H. x 10' wide (Size x Depth) Shape _____

Surface: ☒ Dirt ☐ Wood ☐ Concrete ☐ Lined w/ _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☒ Other Ravine that drains watershed above the facility

Findings:

- ☐ a. The intake works were not inspected.
- ☐ b. The intake works were not tested.
- ☒ c. The intake works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ d. The intake works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ e. The intake works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ f. The intake works needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ g. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

5. Upstream Slope: **(Typical Slope ± 2H : 1V)**

Slope Protection: ☐ None ☒ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Liner _____ ☐ Other: _____
☐ Defect in Protection: Description: some loose riprap on the slope

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☒ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☒ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ and _____ Depth ☒ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☒ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Findings:

☐ a. The upstream slope was not inspected.
☐ b. The upstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☒ c. The upstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The upstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☒ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: The high grass needs to be mowed
☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
☒ i. The upstream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
☐ j. Tree(s) were observed on the dam embankment. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
☐ k. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

6. Crest: Approximate Crest Width: _____ N/A This facility has no crest - w/excavated of basin

Access: ☐ None ☐ Walking Path ☐ Roadway, Surface / Width / Usage: _____

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Findings: N/A

- ☐ a. The dam crest was not inspected.
- ☐ b. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The dam crest appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The dam crest appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions: N/A

- ☐ e. Access along the crest was satisfactory.
- ☐ f. Access along the crest was not possible. Description: _____
- ☐ g. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the crest, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ h. A crack was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ i. A sinkhole was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ j. Portions of the crest were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ k. Tree(s) were observed along the dam crest. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ l. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

No downstream slope - this facility
7. **Downstream Slope:** N/A or excavated as a basin (Typical Slope ± _____ : ____)

Access: ☐ lower roadway along toe ☐ roadway to outlet works ☐ walkway to outlet works ☐ None Observed

Slope Protection: ☐ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Concrete

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Seepage:

Seep Spot Number 1

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings: N/A

☐ a. The downstream slope was not inspected.
☐ b. The downstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The downstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The downstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions: N/A

☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
☐ i. The down stream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
☐ g. Tree(s) were observed on the downstream slope. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
☐ h. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
☐ i. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.
☐ j. The slope was very steep, around a 1 to 1 slope, further study is required to verify slope stability.
☐ k. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

8. Abutments/Toe: N/A No abutments / toe since this structure was excavated at a drainage basin

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Seepage:
Seep Spot Number 1
☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
☐ Flowing, Description: _____
Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2
☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
☐ Flowing, Description: _____
Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____

Findings: N/A

☐ a. The abutments/toe were not inspected.
☐ b. The abutments/toe appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The abutments/toe appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The abutments/toe appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions: N/A

☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☐ g. A crack was observed along the abutments/near the toe, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
☐ h. The abutment/toe area was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
☐ i. Tree(s) were observed along the abutment/toe. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
☐ j. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
☐ k. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.
☐ l. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

9. Outlet Works: N/A No outlet works - water at high level in reservoir flows directly onto the spillway

Culvert / Pipe Type / Size: _____

Culvert: ☐ Concrete ☐ Masonry ☐ unlined earth ☐ Other _____

Pipe: ☐ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☐ Other _____

Control Type: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Other _____

Location: ☐ Control on Upstream side ☐ Control on Downstream side

Seepage: ☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings: N/A

☐ a. The outlet works were not inspected.

☐ b. The outlet works were not tested.

☐ c. The outlet works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

☐ d. The outlet works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.

☐ e. The outlet works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions: N/A

☐ f. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.

☐ g. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area. Failures caused by seepage/piping along the outlet conduit are very common and are considered to be a dangerous situation.

☐ h. Were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.

☐ i. _____

☐ j. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125
HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/06/2006

10. Spillway:

Type: ☐ None ☐ Culvert/Pipe ☒ Channel
Description: Triangular Concrete Pad with Wing Walls
Dimension: 20'x20' ft. Invert elevation: _____ ft. per staff gage
Slope Protection: ☐ None ☐ Grass ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☒ Concrete
☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____
Approach: ☒ Clear ☐ High Veg. ☐ Trees ☐ Other: _____
Erosion: ☐ Scour ☐ Gully ☐ Headcut ☒ Not Observed ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____
Vegetation: ☒ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Findings: Note: Trash Rack Installed over spillway

☒ a. The Spillway appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ b. The Spillway appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ c. The Spillway appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ d. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
☐ e. The spillway approach was blocked. Clear approach.
☐ f. Severe scour erosion was observed which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
☐ g. A headcut (vertical drop in channel due to erosion) was observed downstream of the spillway. Corrective action is required to prevent this problem from moving upstream.
☐ h. Trees are unacceptable in the spillway channel and approach. Take corrective action to address the woody vegetation problem and repair the damaged area.
☐ i. Unclear if spillway is adequately sized. Spillway should pass the probable maximum flood. Verify spillway capacity and take corrective action as required.
☐ j. _____

11. Down Stream Channel:

Name: Ditch (concrete 5'x 7') drains water to Tool Stream
Downstream: ☐ Sump ☐ Open Area ☐ Un-Defined Drainage-way ☒ Defined Drainage-way ☐ Other _____
Items along Stream Bank: ☒ None ☐ Road ☐ Houses ☐ Town ☐ Not Inspected
Description: Subdivision in the process of being developed - no houses at time of this inspection immediately below this facility.

Findings:

☒ a. The downstream channel was not inspected.
☐ b. The downstream channel appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The downstream channel appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The downstream channel appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ e. _____

Dam ID: MA-0125 HAPPY VALLEY FLOOD PREVENTION	Inspection No: _____ Date: 4/06/2006

Additional Comments:

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there appeared to be no immediate threat to the safety of the dam. No assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

The Happy Valley Flood Protection structure resembles a flood retention basin rather than an earth dam. It has no crest or downstream slope and was excavated as a basin without construction of an embankment.

This is an extremely small facility (0.37 acre feet). It appears its purpose is to capture drainage from the watershed above the facility and drain it down to Iao Stream below.

This facility has not been maintained. It seems to function as such, with a spillway and outlet channel that are in good condition, despite the lack of maintenance.

Recommend this facility be inspected by its owner and maintained by mowing the high grass in the reservoir & upstream slope.

Limitations and Intent of this Dam Safety Inspection:

This Dam Safety Inspection was conducted to assess the general overall condition of the reservoir/dam, identify visible deficiencies, and recommend areas of for monitoring, additional investigative studies and corrective actions. The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies. The inspection was conducted under the authority of the Hawaii Revised Statures Chapter 179D, and Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 13, Chapter 190, titled "Dams and Reservoirs". Questions regarding this inspection should be forwarded to the Hawaii State Dam Safety Program; PO Box 373; Honolulu, Hawaii 96809; Ph. (808) 587-0236.

Revised: Dec. 1, 2003